

Applicant : S.V. Sreenivasan et al.  
Serial No. : 10/788,700  
Filed : February 27, 2004  
Page : 6 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 21554-070001 / P107-49-03

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please replace the Figures as filed with the following replacement sheets attached.

### REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected.

#### I. Drawings

Figures 1-5 have been designated by a Prior Art legend. Formal drawings are also hereby provided to replace those that were originally filed with the application.

#### II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8-10, 13, 15-16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Colburn* (Doctor of Philosophy dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 2001). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As the Examiner is well aware, for a claim to be anticipated under § 102, each and every element of the claim must be found within the cited prior art reference.

The claims specifically recite contacting the flowable regions with a plurality of molds disposed on a template. *Colburn* does not teach a plurality of molds. On pages 55-58 of *Colburn*, only a single mold is discussed. With respect to the recited plurality of molds, the Examiner has also pointed to page 22, Fig. 2.1 as showing a plurality of molds. This is an error. The rigid template is a single mold. Nowhere within *Colburn* is it taught or suggested that a plurality of molds are utilized. As the Examiner can see from Figures 6-7, 9A-9B, and 10, the present invention utilizes a plurality of molds 40... 46, as further described in paragraphs [0027]-[0029] of the present application. One skilled in the art in the field of nano-imprint lithography would not interpret the teachings of *Colburn*, and specifically Figure 2.1 on page 22 as showing a plurality of molds. Instead, one would clearly see that (1-A) of Figure 2.1 in *Colburn* shows a rigid template, which would equate to merely one of molds 40, 42, 44, or 46 described in the present application. As a result, the claims are not anticipated by *Colburn*.


III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 4, 6-7, 11-12, 14, 17-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Colburn*. Since these claims depend from allowable claims, these claims are also allowable over *Colburn*.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Howell* (U.S. Patent No. 1,236,304) in view of *Nemoto* (U.S. Patent No. 3,781,214). These prior art references do not pertain to nano-imprint lithography. Since the claims have been amended to recite a method utilized within a nano-imprint lithography system, these rejections are now moot. One skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been able to arrive at the claimed invention in view of *Howell* and *Nemoto*.

Please apply \$75 for excess claim fees and any other necessary charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kelly K. Kordzik  
Reg. No. 36,571

Date: June 6, 2007

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
One Congress Plaza, Suite 810  
111 Congress Avenue  
Austin, TX 78701  
Telephone: (512) 226-8148  
Facsimile: (512) 320-8935